# BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

## IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images, please do not report the images to the Image Problem Mailbox.**

## REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending in the present application.

The Examiner has required election in the present application between:

Group I, claims 2-7, drawn to a method of treating a specific autoimmune disease which comprises administering orally to a mammal particles of biodegradable polymers capable of reducing autoimmune response wherein the autoimmune disease is rheumatoid arthritis;

Group II, claims 2-3 and 5-7, drawn to a method of treating a specific autoimmune disease which comprises administering orally to a mammal particles of biodegradable polymers capable of reducing autoimmune response wherein the autoimmune disease is insulin dependent diabetes mellitus;

Group III, claims 2-3 and 5-7, drawn to a method of treating a specific autoimmune disease which comprises administering orally to a mammal particles of biodegradable polymers capable of reducing autoimmune response wherein the autoimmune disease is uveitis;

Group IV, claims 2-3 and 5-7, drawn to a method of treating a specific autoimmune disease which comprises administering orally to a mammal particles of biodegradable polymers capable of reducing autoimmune response wherein the autoimmune disease is multiple sclerosis;

Group V, claims 2-3 and 5-7, drawn to a method of treating a specific autoimmune disease which comprises administering orally to a mammal particles of biodegradable polymers capable of reducing autoimmune response wherein the autoimmune disease is autoimmune thyroiditis;

Group VI, claims 2-3 and 5-7, drawn to a method of treating a specific autoimmune disease which comprises administering orally to a mammal particles of biodegradable polymers capable of reducing autoimmune response wherein the autoimmune disease is autoimmune hepatitis;

Group VII, claims 2-3 and 5-7, drawn to a method of treating a specific autoimmune disease which comprises administering orally to a mammal particles of biodegradable polymers capable of reducing autoimmune response wherein the autoimmune disease is interstitial pneumonitis;

Group VIII, claims 2-3 and 5-7, drawn to a method of treating a specific autoimmune disease which comprises administering orally to a mammal particles of biodegradable polymers capable of reducing autoimmune response wherein the autoimmune disease is glomerulopnephritis;

Group IX, claims 9-10 and 12-15, drawn to a method of treating a specific autoimmune disease which comprises administering orally to a mammal particles of biodegradable polymers entrapping a specific autoimmune antigen capable of reducing autoimmune response

wherein the autoimmune disease is rheumatoid arthritis and collagen induced arthritis;

Group X, claims 9-10 and 12-15, drawn to a method of treating a specific autoimmune disease which comprises administering orally to a mammal particles of biodegradable polymers entrapping a specific autoimmune antigen capable of reducing autoimmune response wherein the autoimmune disease is multiple sclerosis;

Group XI, claims 9-10 and 12-15, drawn to a method of treating a specific autoimmune disease which comprises administering orally to a mammal particles of biodegradable polymers entrapping a specific autoimmune antigen capable of reducing autoimmune response wherein the autoimmune disease is experiential autoimmune encephalomyelitis;

Group XII, claims 9-10 and 12-15, drawn to a method of treating a specific autoimmune disease which comprises administering orally to a mammal particles of biodegradable polymers entrapping a specific autoimmune antigen capable of reducing autoimmune response wherein the autoimmune disease is insulin dependent diabetes mellitus and experimental diabetes mellitus;

Group XIII, claims 9-10 and 12-15, drawn to a method of treating a specific autoimmune disease which comprises administering orally to a mammal particles of biodegradable polymers entrapping a specific autoimmune antigen capable of

reducing autoimmune response wherein the autoimmune disease is uveitis;

Group XIV, claim 16, drawn to a composition for inducing tolerance for autoimmune disease, which comprises as an active ingredient particles of biodegradable polymers capable of reducing autoimmune response; and

Group XV, claim 17, drawn to a composition for inducing tolerance for autoimmune disease, which comprises as an active ingredient particles of biodegradable polymers entrapping a specific autoimmune antigen capable of reducing autoimmune response;

**For the purpose of examination of the present application, Applicants elect, with traverse, Group I, claims 1-7 and newly added claim 18. The basis of the traversal is as follows. Applicants submit that all the claims share a special technical feature that makes a contribution over the prior art and thus unity of invention is present. Should the Examiner not find a special technical feature shared by all the claims that makes a contribution over the prior art, Applicants respectfully request that a composition and a method of using that composition be examined together consistent with PCT examination procedures. Please see the attached document from ANNEX B from AI-67 in the MPEP (Revised Eighth Edition) wherein a composition (Substance X) and a method of using that composition (use claim 3) are found to**

**have unity of invention (see Example 1). Thus, at least, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner also examine composition claims 16 and 17 with the above elected group.**

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact T. Benjamin Schroeder (Reg. No. 50,990) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Pursuant to the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicants respectfully petition for one (1) month extension of time for filing a response in connection with the present application. The required fee of $110.00 is attached hereto.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By _____ #39,538
Joseph A. Kolasch, #22,463
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

JAK/TBS
**1599-0213P**

Enclosure: Page AI-67 from the MPEP

*[ANNEX B, CONTINUED]*

## PART 2

# EXAMPLES CONCERNING UNITY OF INVENTION

The application of the principles of unity of invention is illustrated by the following examples for guidance in particular cases.

## I. CLAIMS IN DIFFERENT CATEGORIES

**Example 1**

Claim 1: A method of manufacturing chemical substance X.

Claim 2: Substance X.

Claim 3: The use of substance X as an insecticide.

Unity exists between claims 1, 2 and 3. The special technical feature common to all the claims is substance X.

**Example 2**

Claim 1: A process of manufacture comprising steps A and B.

Claim 2: Apparatus specifically designed for carrying out step A.

Claim 3: Apparatus specifically designed for carrying out step B.

Unity exists between claims 1 and 2 or between claims 1 and 3. There is no unity between claims 2 and 3 since there exists no common special technical feature between the two claims.

**Example 3**

Claim 1: A process for painting an article in which the paint contains a new rust inhibiting substance X including the steps of atomizing the paint using compressed air, electrostatically charging the atomized paint using a novel electrode arrangement A and directing the paint to the article.

Claim 2: A paint containing substance X.

Claim 3: An apparatus including electrode arrangement A.

Unity exists between claims 1 and 2 where the common special technical feature is the paint containing substance X or between claims 1 and 3 where the common special technical feature is the electrode arrangement A.

However, unity is lacking between claims 2 and 3 since there exists no common special technical feature between them.

**Example 4**

Claim 1: Use of a family of compounds X as insecticides.

Claim 2: Compound $X_1$ belonging to family X.

Provided $X_1$ has the insecticidal activity and the special technical feature in claim 1 is the insecticidal use, unity is present.